

The Holographic Model of Dark Energy and Thermodynamics of Non-Flat Accelerated Expanding Universe

M. R. Setare ^{*}
S.Shafei

Department of Physics, University of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran

Abstract

Motivated by recent results on non-vanishing spatial curvature [1] we employ the holographic model of dark energy to investigate the validity of first and second laws of thermodynamics in non-flat (closed) universe enclosed by apparent horizon R_A and the event horizon measured from the sphere of horizon named L . We show that for the apparent horizon the first law is roughly respected for different epochs while the second laws of thermodynamics is respected while for L as the system's IR cut-off first law is broken down and second law is respected for special range of deceleration parameter. It is also shown that at late-time universe L is equal to R_A and the thermodynamic laws are hold, when the universe has non-vanishing curvature. Defining the fluid temperature to be proportional to horizon temperature the range for coefficient of proportionality is obtained provided that the generalized second law of thermodynamics is hold.

^{*}e-mail: rezakord@ipm.ir

1 Introduction

The accelerated expansion that based on recent astrophysical data [2], our universe is experiencing is today's most important problem of cosmology. Missing energy density - with negative pressure - responsible for this expansion has been dubbed Dark Energy (DE). Wide range of scenarios have been proposed to explain this acceleration while most of them can not explain all the features of universe or they have so many parameters that makes them difficult to fit. The models which have been discussed widely in literature are those which consider vacuum energy (cosmological constant) [3] as DE, introduce fifth elements and dub it quintessence [4] or scenarios named phantom [5] with $w < -1$, where w is parameter of state.

An approach to the problem of DE arises from holographic Principle that states that the number of degrees of freedom related directly to entropy scales with the enclosing area of the system. It was shown by 'tHooft and Susskind [6] that effective local quantum field theories greatly overcount degrees of freedom because the entropy scales extensively for an effective quantum field theory in a box of size L with UV cut-off Λ . As pointed out by [7], attempting to solve this problem, Cohen *et al.* showed [8] that in quantum field theory, short distance cut-off Λ is related to long distance cut-off L due to the limit set by forming a black hole. In other words the total energy of the system with size L should not exceed the mass of the same size black hole i.e. $L^3 \rho_\Lambda \leq LM_P^2$ where ρ_Λ is the quantum zero-point energy density caused by UV cutoff Λ and M_P denotes Planck mass ($M_P^2 = 1/8\pi G$). The largest L is required to saturate this inequality. Then its holographic energy density is given by $\rho_\Lambda = 3c^2 M_P^2 / 8\pi L^2$ in which c is free dimensionless parameter and coefficient 3 is for convenience.

As an application of Holographic principle in cosmology, it was studied by [9] that consequence of excluding those degrees of freedom of the system which will never be observed by that effective field theory gives rise to IR cut-off L at the future event horizon. Thus in a universe dominated by DE, the future event horizon will tend to constant of the order H_0^{-1} , i.e. the present Hubble radius. The consequences of such a cut-off could be visible at the largest observable scales and particularly in the low CMB multipoles where we deal with discrete wave numbers. Considering the power spectrum in finite universe as a consequence of holographic constraint, with different boundary conditions, and fitting it with LSS, CMB and supernova data, a cosmic duality between dark energy equation of state and power spectrum is obtained that can describe the low l features extremely well.

Based on cosmological state of holographic principle, proposed by Fischler and Susskind [10], the Holographic Model of Dark Energy (HDE) has been proposed and studied widely in the literature [11, 12]. In [13] using the type Ia supernova data, the model of HDE is constrained once when c is unity and another time when c is taken as free parameter. It is concluded that the HDE is consistent with recent observations, but future observations are needed to constrain this model more precisely. In another paper [14], the anthropic principle for HDE is discussed. It is found that, provided that the amplitude of fluctuation are variable the anthropic consideration favors the HDE over the cosmological constant.

In HDE, in order to determine the proper and well-behaved system's IR cut-off, there are some difficulties that must be studied carefully to get

results adapted with experiments that claim our universe has accelerated expansion. For instance, in the model proposed by [11], it is discussed that considering particle horizon, R_p ,

$$R_p = a \int_0^t \frac{dt}{a} = a \int_0^a \frac{da}{Ha^2} \quad (1)$$

as the IR cut-off, the HDE density reads to be

$$\rho_\Lambda \propto a^{-2(1+\frac{1}{\epsilon})}, \quad (2)$$

that implies $w > -1/3$ which does not lead to accelerated universe. Also it is shown in [15] that for the case of closed universe, it violates the holographic bound.

The problem of taking apparent horizon (Hubble horizon) - the outermost surface defined by the null rays which instantaneously are not expanding, $R_A = 1/H$ - as the IR cut-off in the flat universe, was discussed by Hsu [16]. According to Hsu's argument, employing Friedman equation $\rho = 3M_P^2 H^2$ where ρ is the total energy density and taking $L = H^{-1}$ we will find $\rho_m = 3(1 - c^2)M_P^2 H^2$. Thus either ρ_m and ρ_Λ behave as H^2 . So the DE results pressureless, since ρ_Λ scales as like as matter energy density ρ_m with the scale factor a as a^{-3} . Also, taking apparent horizon as the IR cut-off may result the constant parameter of state w , which is in contradiction with recent observations implying variable w [17]. In our consideration for non-flat universe, because of the small value of Ω_k we can consider our model as a system which departs slightly from flat space. Consequently we respect the results of flat universe so that we treat apparent horizon only as an arbitrary distance and not as the system's IR cut-off.

On the other hand taking the event horizon, R_h , where

$$R_h = a \int_t^\infty \frac{dt}{a} = a \int_a^\infty \frac{da}{Ha^2} \quad (3)$$

to be the IR cut-off, gives the results compatible with observations for flat universe.

It is fair to claim that simplicity and reasonability of HDE provides more reliable frame to investigate the problem of DE rather than other models proposed in the literature[3, 4, 5]. For instance the coincidence or "why now" problem is easily solved in some models of HDE based on this fundamental assumption that matter and holographic dark energy do not conserve separately, but the matter energy density decays into the holographic energy density [18].

Since the discovery of black hole thermodynamics in 1970 physicists have speculated thermodynamics of cosmological models in accelerated expanding universe [19]. Related to present work, in [20], for either time independent and time-dependent equation of state (EoS), the first and second laws of thermodynamics in flat universe were investigated. For the case of constant EoS, the first law is valid for apparent horizon (Hubble horizon) and it does not hold for event horizon as system's IR cut-off. When the EoS is assumed to be time dependent, using holographic model of dark energy in flat space, the same result is gained: The event horizon, in contradict with apparent horizon, does not satisfy the first law. Also,

while the event horizon does not respect the second law, it is hold for the universe enclosed by apparent horizon.

Some experimental data has implied that our universe is not a perfectly flat universe and recent papers have favored the universe with spatial curvature [1]. As a matter of fact, we want to remark that although it is believed that our universe is flat, a contribution to the Friedmann equation from spatial curvature is still possible if the number of e-foldings is not very large [21]. Therefore, it would be interesting to investigate the laws of thermodynamics for non-flat universe, and determine for what distances, the thermodynamic laws, are satisfied when the curvature is non-vanishing.

Defining the appropriate distance, for the case of non-flat universe has another story. Some aspects of the problem has been discussed in [21, 22]. In this case, the event horizon can not be considered as the system's IR cut-off, because for instance, when the dark energy is dominated and $c = 1$, where c is a positive constant, $\Omega_\Lambda = 1 + \Omega_k$, we find $\dot{R}_h < 0$, while we know that in this situation we must be in de Sitter space with constant EoS. To solve this problem, another distance is considered- radial size of the event horizon measured on the sphere of the horizon, denoted by L - and the evolution of holographic model of dark energy in non-flat universe is investigated.

In present paper, using the holographic model of dark energy in non-flat universe, we study the validity of first and second law of thermodynamics in present time for a universe enveloped by R_A and L . In section 2, as the thermodynamic laws are applicable in equilibrium, we first investigate whether these distances change dominantly over one hubble time, $t_H = 1/H$, and then we study the validity of first law. In section 3, the second law of thermodynamics is studied. In final section, some conclusions are represented.

We take $\hbar = k_B = G = c = 1$.

2 First Law of Thermodynamics

We consider the non-flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker universe with line element

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) \left(\frac{dr^2}{1 - kr^2} + r^2 d\Omega^2 \right). \quad (4)$$

where k denotes the curvature of space $k=0,1,-1$ for flat, closed and open universe respectively. In non-flat universe, our choice for holographic dark energy density is

$$\rho_\Lambda = 3c^2 L^{-2}. \quad (5)$$

As it was mentioned, c is a positive constant in holographic model of dark energy ($c \geq 1$) and the coefficient 3 is for convenient. L is defined as the following form:

$$L = ar(t), \quad (6)$$

here, a , is scale factor and $r(t)$ can be obtained from the following equation

$$\int_0^{r(t)} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{1 - kr^2}} = \int_t^\infty \frac{dt}{a} = \frac{R_h}{a}, \quad (7)$$

where R_h is event horizon. For closed universe we have (same calculation is valid for open universe by transformation)

$$r(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sin y. \quad (8)$$

where $y \equiv \sqrt{k}R_h/a$. The EoS of DE reads to be (relation obtained in [21]):

$$w_\Lambda = \frac{-1}{3}(1 + \frac{2}{c}\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda} \cos y). \quad (9)$$

Here Ω_Λ is dimensionless DE density, $\Omega_\Lambda = \rho_\Lambda/\rho_{cr}$. Putting its present value $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.73$, a lower bound for w_Λ , is obtained to be -0.90 , provided that $c = 1$. If $c \geq 1$, then w_Λ will be always larger than -1 . For $c < 1$, $\omega_\Lambda < -1$ and the holographic DE will have phantom-like behavior, but imposing the Gibbons-Hawking entropy in a closed universe results $c > 1$ to avoid decreasing entropy. Thus the holographic model of DE can not behave like phantom. For more general bound on parameter c see [23]. Our study is due to present time, so the ordinary matter is taken into account. The critical energy density, ρ_{cr} , DE density, ρ_Λ , and the energy density of curvature, ρ_k , are given by following relations respectively:

$$\rho_{cr} = 3H^2, \quad \rho_\Lambda = 3c^2 L^{-2}, \quad \rho_k = \frac{3k}{a^2}. \quad (10)$$

Using definition Ω_Λ and relation (10), $\dot{L}$ gets:

$$\dot{L} = HL + ar(t) = \frac{c}{\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda}} - \cos y, \quad (11)$$

so one can easily find that

$$t_H \frac{\dot{L}}{L} = 1 - \frac{\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda}}{c} \cos y. \quad (12)$$

Clearly, L does not change dominantly over one Hubble time, thus the laws of thermodynamics can be applied here.

From [24] the amount of energy crossing the surface specified by L during time interval dt is obtained as following

$$-dE = 4\pi L^2 T_{ab} k^a k^b dt = 4\pi L^2 \rho_{cr} (1 + w) dt. \quad (13)$$

where k_a and k_b are ingoing null vector fields and w is related to total pressure and energy density of matter enveloped by horizon. We find

$$-dE = \frac{c^2}{\Omega_\Lambda} \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{\Omega_\Lambda}{2} - \frac{\Omega_\Lambda^{3/2}}{c} \cos y \right), \quad (14)$$

to obtain this relation we have replaced w by $w_\Lambda \Omega_\Lambda$. Employing black hole thermodynamics, based on Bekenstein [25], Hawking and Gibbons works [26], and generalizing it to our cosmological horizons, we define the temperature and entropy to be (for L):

$$T_L = \frac{1}{2\pi L}, \quad S_L = \pi L^2 \quad (15)$$

Hence

$$T_L dS = \dot{L} dt = \left(\frac{c}{\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda}} - \cos y \right) dt \quad (16)$$

Comparing relations (14) and (16) we see that the first law of thermodynamics is not satisfied for L

$$-dE \neq T dS. \quad (17)$$

On the other hand, we want to assert that redefining the temperature of IR cut-off L to be e.g. de Sitter temperature $T = H/2\pi$, will not change

the invalidity of first law for the case of $L = ar(t)$ (The calculation is straightforward as what has been performed in [20] for the case of flat universe.). So in continue our choice for the IR cut-off's temperature is $T_L = 1/2\pi L$.

For the case of apparent horizon (Hubble horizon) - which we consider it as an alternative distance to study our physical laws in the universe enveloped by - we first investigate the ability of applying thermodynamics laws. Using the following relation we find an expression for H^{-1}

$$\Omega_m = 1 + \Omega_k - \Omega_\Lambda = \frac{\rho_m}{3H^2} = \Omega_m^0 H_0^2 H^{-2} a^{-3} \quad (18)$$

where, $\rho_m = \Omega_m^0 \rho_{cr}^0 a^{-3}$ and H_0 denotes the present value of Hubble parameter and

$$\Omega_k = \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{cr}} = \frac{\Omega_k^0 \rho_{cr}^0 a^{-2}}{3H^2} = \Omega_k^0 H_0^2 H^{-2} a^{-2}. \quad (19)$$

Using (18) and (19) we find

$$\frac{1}{H} = \frac{a^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\Omega_m^0} H_0} \left(\frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{1 - a\gamma} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (20)$$

here $\gamma \equiv \Omega_k^0 / \Omega_m^0 < 1$. Taking derivative in both sides of (20) with respect to $x (\equiv \ln a)$, and after some calculation, we obtain

$$H \frac{d}{dx} H^{-1} = 1 - \frac{\Omega_\Lambda^{3/2} \cos y}{c} + \frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{2(1 - a\gamma)}, \quad (21)$$

where we have used following relation in which prime sign denotes derivative respect to x [21]:

$$\Omega_\Lambda' = \Omega_\Lambda (1 - \Omega_\Lambda) \left(\frac{2}{c} \sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda} \cos y + \frac{1}{1 - a\gamma} \right). \quad (22)$$

For R_A we have

$$t_h \frac{\dot{R}_A}{R_A} = H \frac{dH^{-1}}{dx}. \quad (23)$$

Fortunately from (21) it is easily seen that we are allowed to use thermodynamic laws for R_A . In fact neither R_A nor L change dominantly over one Hubble time. Clearly, in (21), if $k \rightarrow 0$, then the result will be equal to what has been obtained for the case of R_A in flat universe.

Modifying relations (14) and (15), for R_A , so that

$$T_A = \frac{1}{2\pi R_A}, \quad S_A = \pi R_A^2.$$

We obtain the following relations:

$$-dE = \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{\Omega_\Lambda}{2} - \frac{\Omega_\Lambda^{3/2}}{c} \cos y \right) dt \quad (24)$$

and

$$T_A dS_A = \left(1 + \frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{2(1 - a\gamma)} - \frac{\Omega_\Lambda^{3/2}}{c} \cos y \right) dt. \quad (25)$$

At the first sight, it looks that the first law is violated. To consider different situations precisely, we concentrate on the second term in parentheses of RHS of relation (25), where difficulties arise. Using some approximation for this term, and applying that in the relation (8) and comparing

with the relation (24), the validity of the first law in different epochs can be studied. Roughly speaking, in the early universe, where a approaches to zero, we can write

$$\frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{2(1 - a\gamma)} \simeq \frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{2} \quad (26)$$

then first law is hold. At present-time we have, (taking $a = 1$)

$$\frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{2(1 - a\gamma)} = \frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{2(1 - \gamma)},$$

but noting that $\Omega_k^0 = 0.01$ and $\Omega_m^0 = 1 + \Omega_k^0 - \Omega_\Lambda^0 \simeq 0.28$ then $\gamma \equiv \Omega_k^0/\Omega_m^0 \sim 0.04$, one can ignore γ in denominator and

$$\frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{2(1 - a\gamma)} \simeq \frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{2}, \quad (27)$$

thereby the first law is roughly hold. Since for close future we can assume that $a\gamma$ is much smaller than 1, then

$$\frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{2(1 - a\gamma)} = \frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{2}(1 + a\gamma), \quad (28)$$

and likewise the present time the first law is approximately respected. Eventually at late-time universe where $\Omega_\Lambda \simeq 1$ the first law is hold provided that a remains finite. Strictly speaking, only in late-time universe, one can result that the first law of thermodynamics is hold with no approximation.

As we saw, for L , as an the IR cut-off of our system, the first law of thermodynamics did not hold in present time and non-flat universe. Discussed by [20], the reason could be that the first law is valid only when it is applied to nearby states of local thermodynamics equilibrium and the IR cut-off that we considered reflects global properties of the universe. Also, we discussed above that the particle horizon did not work, due to it does not lead to an accelerated universe and apparent horizon (Hubble horizon) have some difficulties mentioned in introduction. Therefore it looks that we need to define new distances or redefine some of parameters-e.g Hawking temperature - so that the thermodynamic laws are satisfied, although we remarked before, that applying Hawking temperature $T = 1/(2\pi R_A)$ for L in studying the validity of first law does not solve the problem, as it did not solve the problem of event horizon, R_h , in flat universe.

It is worthwhile to remind that one can investigate these relations in open universe by transforming $k \rightarrow -k$, $\rho_k \rightarrow -\rho_k$, $\Omega_k \rightarrow \Omega_k$, $\gamma \rightarrow -\gamma$.

3 Second Law of Thermodynamics

Here, we study the validity of generalized second law (GSL) of thermodynamics. According to GSL, for our system, the sum of the entropy of matter enclosed by horizon and the entropy of horizon must not be decreasing function of time. We investigate this law for the universe filled with perfect fluid described by normal scalar field (quintessence-like). For this purpose, we consider the enclosed matter and calculate its entropy.

Before going into mathematics of GSL, we want to figure out remarkable points about the temperature of the fluid. According to generalization the black hole thermodynamics to our cosmological model, we have

taken the temperature of our horizon to be $T_L = (1/2\pi L)$ where L denotes the size of the universe. In investigation the GSL, definition the temperature of the fluid needs further discussions. The only temperature in hand is the horizon temperature. If the fluid temperature is equal with the horizon temperature, the system will be in equilibrium. Other possibilities [27, 28] is that the fluid temperature is proportional to horizon temperature i.e. for the fluid enveloped by apparent horizon $T = bH/2\pi$. In continue, We shall show that if we want the generalized second law of thermodynamics to be hold, redefining fluid temperature to be $T = bH/2\pi$ impose an upper bound on b to be 1. But for now, it looks reasonable to take $b = 1$ [29].

The entropy of the matter has the following relation with its pressure and energy

$$dS = \frac{1}{T} (PdV + dE) \quad (29)$$

where V is the volume containing the matter.

For the apparent horizon, we have $V = 4\pi R_A^3/3$, $E = 4\pi\rho R_A^3/3 = R_A/2$, $P = w\rho = w_\Lambda\Omega_\Lambda 3H^2/8\pi$, then

$$dS = \pi(1 + 3w_\Lambda\Omega_\Lambda)R_AdR_A. \quad (30)$$

Using $R_AdR_A = -H^{-3}(dH/dx)dx$ one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS}{dx} &= -\pi(1 + 3w_\Lambda\Omega_\Lambda)H^{-3}\frac{dH}{dx} \\ &= -\pi(1 - \Omega_\Lambda - \frac{2}{c}\Omega_\Lambda^{3/2}\cos y)H^{-3}\frac{dH}{dx} \\ &= -2\pi qH^{-3}\frac{dH}{dx}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Here q is deceleration parameter defined as following

$$q = -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} - 1 = -\frac{\Omega_\Lambda^{3/2}\cos y}{c} + \frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{2(1 - a\gamma)} \simeq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \Omega_\Lambda - \frac{2}{c}\Omega_\Lambda^{3/2}\cos y). \quad (32)$$

The entropy of apparent horizon, is $S_A = \pi R_A^2$, so one can easily find

$$\frac{dS_A}{dx} = -2\pi H^{-3}\frac{dH}{dx}. \quad (33)$$

From the equations (31) and (33) it is obtained

$$\frac{d}{dx}(S + S_A) = 2\pi H^{-2}\left(\frac{dH}{dx}\right)^2 \quad (34)$$

which is clearly positive. Hence it is precisely concluded that GSL is respected for the sum of the entropy of apparent horizon and the entropy of matter enveloped by.

As we mentioned before, we want to show that defining the fluid temperature to be $T = bH/2\pi$, imposes upper bound on b provided that the GSL is satisfied. The equations will modify as follows:

$$dS = \frac{1}{T} (PdV + dE) = \frac{\pi}{b}(1 + 3w_\Lambda\Omega_\Lambda)R_AdR_A. \quad (35)$$

One can find

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{2\pi\dot{H}}{bH^3}\left(\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} + 1\right), \quad (36)$$

and

$$\frac{dS_A}{dt} = -\frac{2\pi\dot{H}}{H} \quad (37)$$

Thus it can be easily seen that

$$\frac{d}{dt}(S + S_A) = \frac{2\pi\dot{H}}{bH^3}(1 - b + \frac{\dot{H}}{H^2}). \quad (38)$$

If we note that for our model $\dot{H} < 0$, then the term in parentheses of RHS must be ≤ 0 . Therefore a upper bound is obtained for b to be:

$$b \geq 1 + \frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} \quad (39)$$

As $\dot{H} < 0$ - assuming that we are in quintessence-like behavior- the RHS of inequality above is always smaller than or equal with 1.

For L we find the following relations

$$\frac{dS}{dx} = \frac{-\pi c^4}{H^2 \Omega_\Lambda^2} \left(\frac{1 + 3w_\Lambda \Omega_\Lambda}{H} \frac{dH}{dx} + \frac{3 + 3w_\Lambda \Omega_\Lambda}{2\Omega_\Lambda} \Omega'_\Lambda \right) \quad (40)$$

and

$$\frac{dS_L}{dx} = -\frac{\pi c^2}{H^2 \Omega_\Lambda^2} \left(2 \frac{\Omega_\Lambda}{H} \frac{dH}{dx} + \Omega'_\Lambda \right). \quad (41)$$

Using relations (40) and (41) we find

$$\frac{d}{dx}(S + S_L) = \frac{\pi c^4}{H^2 \Omega_\Lambda^2} \left\{ (1 + q) \left(2q + \frac{2\Omega_\Lambda}{c^2} \right) + \left(\frac{1 - \Omega_\Lambda}{\Omega_\Lambda} \right) (2q - 1) \left(1 + q + \frac{\Omega_\Lambda}{c^2} \right) \right\}. \quad (42)$$

We restrict our consideration to present time, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.73$ and take c to be 1 (changing c slightly to get bigger than 1, only moves slightly the range of amounts that q can take.) The sign of $\frac{d}{dx}(S + S_L)$ depends on the sign of expressions $(2q + \frac{2\Omega_\Lambda}{c^2})$ and $(2q - 1)$, since other expressions are clearly positive. To determine the sign of q , we pay attention that amounts that q can take, depend on the sign of $\dot{H}$. For $\dot{H} > 0$ we have phantom-like behavior and from previous discussions we know since the Hawking-Gibbon's bound does not allow our holographic DE model to be of this kind, we have to rule out this possibility. If $\dot{H} = 0$ we are in de-Sitter space-time and $q = -1$, therefore $\frac{d}{dx}(S + S_L) = 0$. Eventually for the case of $\dot{H} < 0$ we find $q > -1$. Simplifying (42) by means of putting values of $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.73$ and $c = 1$ makes the following form

$$\frac{d}{dx}(S + S_L) = 2.74 (0.22 + q)(1.38 + q). \quad (43)$$

From (43) we find that for $q > -0.22$ then $\frac{d}{dx}(S + S_L) > 0$ while for $q \in [-1, -0.22]$ we find $\frac{d}{dx}(S + S_L) < 0$. Hence one can result, either in de Sitter space-time and for our accelerated model with $q > -0.22$ the generalized second law of thermodynamics is respected.

In the end of this section we want to remark that at late-time universe, where Ω_Λ approaches to unity, provided that we take $c = 1$, we find that $R_A = L$ and using relations (14, 16, 24, 25) it is clear that the first law is satisfied. Also about the second law, at late-time universe the relation (42) is in absolute consistency with (34), therefore the second law is also respected at late-time and non-flat universe.

4 Summary

In order to solve cosmological problems and because the lack of our knowledge, for instance to determine what could be the best candidate for DE to explain the accelerated expansion of universe, the cosmologists try to approach to best results as precise as they can by considering all the possibilities they have. Investigating the principles of thermodynamics and specially the second law- as global accepted principle in the universe - in different models of DE, as one of these possibilities, has been widely studied in the literature, since this investigation can constrain some of parameters in studied models, say, P. C. Davies [27] studied the change in event horizon area in cosmological models that depart slightly from de Sitter space and showed that for this models the GSL is respected for the normal scalar field, provided the fluid to be viscous.

It is of interest to remark that in the literature, the different scenarios of DE has never been studied via considering special similar horizon, as in [27] the apparent horizon, $1/H$, determines our universe while in [28] the universe is enclosed by event horizon, R_h . As we discussed above for flat universe the convenient horizon looks to be R_h while in non flat universe we define L because of the problems that arise if we consider R_h or R_p (these problems arise if we consider them as the system's IR cut-off). Thus it looks that we need to define a horizon that satisfies all of our accepted principles; in [30] a linear combination of event and apparent horizon, as IR cut-off has been considered.

In present paper, we studied L , as the horizon measured from the sphere of the horizon as system's IR cut-off and apparent (or Hubble) horizon. We investigated the first and second law of thermodynamics at present time for the universe enveloped by this horizons and obtained that for apparent horizon just like the flat case, the first and second law in non-flat universe are respected while for L the first law did not hold and second law was satisfied just for a range of q which q was deceleration parameter. We related the invalidity of the first law for L due to this point that L reflects the global properties of the system while the first law is related to local thermodynamics equilibrium. Also, we showed that at late-time universe L is equal to R_A and the thermodynamic laws are satisfied at this time.

5 Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank the referee because of his/her useful comments, which assisted to prepare better frame for this study.

References

- [1] C. L. Bennet et al, *astrophys. J. Suppl.*, 148, (2003) 1; D. N. Spergel, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.*, 148, (2003), 175; K. Ichikawa et al, *astro-ph/0605481*.
- [2] S. Perlmutter et al, *Nature (London)*, 391, 51, (1998); Knop. R et al., *Astroph. J.*, 598, 102 (2003); A. G. Riess et al., *Astroph. J.*, 607, 665(2004); H. Jassal, J. Bagla and T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Rev. D*, 72, 103503 (2005).

- [3] For review on cosmological constant problem: P. J. E. Peebles, B. Ratra, Rev. Mod. Phys., 75, 559-606, (2003); J. Kratochvil, A. Linde, E. V. Linder, M. Shmakova, JCAP, 0407, 001, (2004).
- [4] R. R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett., 80, (1998) 1582; I. Zlater, L. Wang and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett., 82, (1999), 896; T. Chiba, gr-qc/9903094; M. S. Turner and M. White Phys. Rev. D, 56, (1997), 4439.
- [5] R. R. Caldwell, Phys. Lett. B 545, 23, (2002); R. R. Caldwell, M. Kamionkowski and N. N. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett, 91, 071301, (2003); S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Lett., B **562**, (2003), 147; S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Lett., B **565**, (2003), 1; S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Rev., D, 72, 023003, (2005); S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, O. G. Gorbunova, J. Phys., A, 39, 6627, (2006); S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Lett. B **632**, 597, (2006).
- [6] L. Susskind, J. Math. Phys, **36**, (1995), 6377-6396.
- [7] Y. S. Myung, Phys. Lett. B **610**, (2005), 18-22.
- [8] A. Cohen, D. Kaplan and A. Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett 82, (1999), 4971.
- [9] K. Enqvist, S. Hannestad and M. S. Sloth, JCAP, 0502, (2005) 004.
- [10] W. Fischler and L. Susskind, hep-th/9806039.
- [11] M. Li, Phy. Lett. B, 603, 1, (2004).
- [12] D. N. Vollic, hep-th/0306149; H. Li, Z. K. Guo and Y. Z. Zhang, astro-ph/0602521; J. P. B. Almeida and J. G. Pereira, gr-qc/0602103; D. Pavon and W. Zimdahl, hep-th/0511053; Y. Gong, Phys. Rev., D, 70, (2004), 064029; B. Wang, E. Abdalla, R. K. Su, Phys. Lett., B, 611, (2005).
- [13] Q. G. Huang, Y. Gong, JCAP, 0408, (2004), 006.
- [14] Q. G. Huang, M. Li, JCAP, 0503, (2005), 001.
- [15] R. Easther and D. A. Lowe hep-th/9902088.
- [16] S. D. H. Hsu, Phys. Lett. B, 594, 13, (2004).
- [17] U. Alam, V. Sahni, T. D. Saini, A. A. Starobinsky, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 354, 275 (2004); D. Huterer and A. Cooray, Phys. Rev., D, 71, 023506, (2005), Y. Wang and M. Tegmark, astro-ph/0501351.
- [18] B. Hu, Y. Ling, Phys. Rev. D **73** (2006) 123510.
- [19] Q. Huang and M. Li, JCAP 0408, 013 (2004); R. Brustein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2072 (2000); P. F. Gonzalez-Diaz, hep-th/0411070; P. C. W. Davies, Class. Quant. Grav 5, 1349 (1988); G. Izquierdo and D. Pavon, Phys. Lett., B, 633 (2006) 420.
- [20] B. Wang, Y. Gong, E. Abdalla, gr-qc/0511051.
- [21] Q. G. Huang and M. Li, JCAP, 08, 006, (2004).
- [22] B. Guberina, R. Horvat and H. Nikolić, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 125011, (2005).
- [23] Y. Gong , Y. Z. Zhang, Class. Quant. Grav. **22** 4895, (2005).
- [24] R. Bousso, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 064024 (2004).
- [25] J. D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D **9**, 3292 (1974); J. D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 2333 (1973).

- [26] G. W. Gibbons, S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 2738, (1977).
- [27] P. C. Davies, Class. Quantum. Grav. **L225**, 4, (1987).
- [28] H. Mohseni Sadjadi, Phys. Rev. D, **73**, 063525, (2006).
- [29] G. Izquierdo and D. Pavon, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 127505 (2004).
- [30] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, hep-th/0506212.